

REMARKS

The specification stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. A substitute specification without claims, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. Section 1.125, is being submitted herewith. Please replace the original specification with the attached specification, which is being provided as both a clean copy and a copy showing changes made. The Applicant asserts that the substitute specification does not contain any new matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 14, 15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claim invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 18 has been amended to direct the claim to the statutory subject matter of a computer program product including instructions embodied on a computer readable medium. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimbo et al., USPN 6,760,840 filed 8/26/1998.

Shimbo (US 6,760,840) discloses a file editing system for realizing asynchronous editing of a shared file by a plurality of users. (Shimbo, col. 1, lines 13-15). The file editing system uses a file record management scheme (or version management scheme) that maintains only a difference between different versions instead of maintaining a complete copy of each file version at a given moment. (Shimbo, col. 2, lines 22-33; col. 7, lines 1-67; col. 8, lines 1-65). When two users are editing the file at the same or overlapping times, there is potential for a contradiction

when the edited files are being saved. (Shimbo, col. 8, lines 8-29). Shimbo avoids contradictions by making every new file version capable of merging all the changes that have been made up to then. (Shimbo, col. 8, lines 27-29).

For example, when the write-back of an editing action (E1) is to be made first, a new version (V. 5) is created by storing editing procedures ($\Delta 1$) as a difference with respect to the editing target version (V. 4) in a format suitable for the record management scheme. Then, when the write-back of a second editing action (E2) by a second user is to be made, the second editing procedures ($\Delta 2$) which specify a difference with respect to the editing target version (V. 4) are converted into converted editing procedures ($\Delta 2'$) which specify a difference with respect to the latest version (V. 5), and the new version (V. 6) is created by storing converted editing procedures ($\Delta 2'$) as a difference with respect to the previous version (V. 5) in a format suitable for the record management scheme. (Shimbo, col. 8, lines 47-55).

However, there is a possibility that the new record management information that corresponds to the converted editing procedures ($\Delta 2'$) and the new file version (V. 6) cannot be merged with the latest version at that time because the file version has again been updated by some other client. (Shimbo, col. 18, lines 31-61). To prevent repetitive processing in this manner, it is possible to utilize a lock function on the updating of the file data beginning at the time that the record data are transmitted to the client and being released when the updating of the file data is completed. (Shimbo, col. 18, lines 62-67; col. 19, lines 1-7).

The present claims are directed to a method for specializing content. The method provides a page having a defined layout and layers that have immutable parts that cannot be edited by the next administration level and changeable parts that may be edited by the next administration level resulting in a delta to the defined layer. Each layer has a different administration level that controls the content that is added to that layer, controls the changeable content that is deleted from the previous layer, and controls what content will be immutable to the next administration level. The content within the layer may be changed repeatedly over time according to the current desires of the administration level.

By contrast, Shimbo discloses a file editing system for realizing asynchronous editing of a shared file by a plurality of users. Shimbo discloses how to save differences between subsequent versions of the same file in order to avoid contradictions. Those users that are allowed access to the file have no restrictions on the changes that they can make to the file. The new version resulting from the user's changes is saved in the form of a difference file, but there is no administration level or controls in place to limit the extent of these changes. Furthermore, once a particular version is saved, any other changes would result in a further new version rather than directing changes to the previous version.

According to Shimbo, a server manages a plurality of files containing data and information for record management, such as a list of user names for whom access is allowed. However, there is nothing about the disclosure of Shimbo that would teach or suggest implementing an access control scheme that uses administration levels within a page. The step of "granting access rights to said delta to the next administration level for specialization purposes" means that not every administration level (user) can access the delta. This is much different than what is taught by Shimbo, where any user that is authorized to access the file can change anything about the file and cause the creation of a new file version or even multiple new file versions. Even so, Shimbo does not make any provisions for editing old file versions, because this would cause all of the subsequent file versions to be incorrect.

The examiner asserts that the limitation of "defining parts of said delta to be unchanged by the next administration level" is disclosed by Shimbo at col. 18, lines 39-67. However, the cited passage from Shimbo deals with the possibility that multiple users are saving new file versions during overlapping time periods such that certain record management information cannot be merged. If this happens, Shimbo sends additional record data to the client side, so that the editing procedure conversion can be carried out to generate new record management information that is then sent to the server again. (Shimbo, col. 18, lines 31-54). "Here, there is the possibility that the new record management information cannot be merged again." (Shimbo,

col. 18, lines 55-56). Consequently, there is a possibility for circulating through the loop many times. (Shimbo, col. 18, lines 59-61). To solve this problem, Shimbo discloses a temporary lock in the passage that follows:

In order to prevent such a repetitive processing, it is possible to utilize the lock function. Namely, at a timing at which the record data are transmitted to the client 91, the server 90 side sets the lock on the updating of the file data, and releases the lock at the timing at which the updating of the file data is completed after the record management information is received from that client 91.
(Shimbo, col. 18, line 62 through col. 19, line 1)

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Shimbo's "lock function" does not prevent changes from being made to the file, but rather causes a short delay in other changes being made so that a particular file version can be completed and saved. The other changes are then allowed to be processed and saved. This is much different than the limitation of "defining parts of said delta to be unchanged by the next administration level", as set out in claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In reference to dependent claim 2, the Examiner asserts that Shimbo's record management system could set administration levels for multiple users and multiple levels. (Office Action, page 6, lines 5-9). This assertion is unsupported and it is unclear if the Examiner is taking official notice. A finding of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 requires that there must be some suggestion to modify the reference. Furthermore, if Shimbo were so modified, Applicant asserts that Shimbo's invention would no longer work for its intended purpose, because users would not be able to edit the entire file. As such, there would then be no asynchronous editing and no potential for contradictory changes – the very problems that Shimbo sought to address. Accordingly, the modification would not be obvious. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Dependent claim 3 has been amended to remove the reference to "with or without frames." Claim 3 specifies that the new layer has at least one container being assigned by an identification to at least one parent container of a previous layer. Shimbo does not teach, show or

suggest this limitation. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In reference to claim 4, the Examiner asserts that Shimbo suggests a tree structure. However, Applicant asserts that the multiple versions are each stored with sequential version numbers without any accommodation for different branches of versions to exist. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In reference to claim 6, Shimbo does not teach or suggest an aggregation component for aggregation of content provided by said portlets. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In reference to claim 7, Shimbo may teach adding or deleting content from a file, but Shimbo does not teach, show or suggest a delta in a new layer within a page resulting in the addition or deletion of a container or frame from a defined layer within the page. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In reference to claim 8, Shimbo's use of a file ID merely identifies what file was edited. The claim limitation of claim 8, stating "wherein a portlet ID is assigned to each frame" indicates that each frame within the layers of the page receives content rendered by a portlet. This configuration is not taught or suggested by Shimbo. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In reference to claim 12, Shimbo keeps track of various file versions, but does not teach, show or suggest keeping track of layer IDs, parent layer IDs, and assigned page ID for each newly added layer. As previously discussed, a sequence of versions of a single file is much different than layers of a page. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 13 includes the limitation of "wherein each newly added container is added in an

existing container table which contains container IDs, their parent container IDs, and their assigned layer IDs.” Shimbo does not teach, show or suggest the use of layers or the use of containers, let alone a container table, container IDs, parent container IDs, and assigned layer IDs. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In reference to claims 13 and 14, Shimbo allows the deletion of data from a file, but does not teach, show or suggest the user of layers, the use of containers, the use of a container table, or the deletion or movement of information in a container table. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In reference to claims 16-21, the Examiner has stated that the claims recite similar limitations to those found in claims 1-10. Accordingly, the Applicant reasserts its comments made above with regard to claims 1-10. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the event there are additional charges in connection with the filing of this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account No. 50-0714/IBM-0080 of the firm of the below-signed attorney in the amount of any necessary fee.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey L. Streets, #37,453/

Jeffrey L. Streets
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,453
STREETS & STEELE
13831 Northwest Freeway, Suite 355
Houston, Texas 77040
(713)939-9444